

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 3-23 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 11, 16 and 20-23 are amended and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments with the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants sincerely acknowledge the Office Actions indication that claims 2-7, 11-19 and 22-23 define patentable subject matter. However, for at least the reasons set forth below applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

A. The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,822,871 to Lee et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that allowable subject matter from claim 2 is incorporated into claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines patentable subject matter for at least that reason. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under § 102 is respectfully requested.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 8-10 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lee and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0064688 to Mizuta et al. (hereafter Mizuta). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee and Mizuta, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least features of a stopper mechanism that includes a plurality of stoppers and a plurality of stopper grooves and combinations thereof as recited in claim 20. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee and Mizuta, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of a stopper mechanism and combinations thereof as recited.

In contrast, the Office Action admits that Lee does not disclose a stopper mechanism. See page 3, Item 3, discussion of claim 8 in the Office Action. However, with respect to claim 21 the Office Action asserts that Lee discloses in Figures 6, 7 and 8 that a slide unit 102 can be selectively slid to an open position, a first position and a closed position. See page 5, lines 3-7 of the Office Action that discusses claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that Figures 6-8 of Lee disclose movement between an open position and a closed position. See col. 2 line 63-col. 3 line 3 and col. 6 lines 6-24 of Lee.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mizuta discloses a stop-release operation member 301 depressed to release a lock mechanism so that a first and second unit 100, 200 of a portable terminal can extend to a open state from a retracted state. See paragraph 56 of Mizuta. The stop-release operation member 301 can include an inwardly protruding piece 301a that contacts a stop spring 304 that can reciprocally engage a stop recess

portion 100c. See paragraphs 59-62 of Mizuta. However, the releasable lock mechanism provides a one-touch sliding operation that allows a portable telephone to change from the retracted state to the extended state. See paragraphs 87, 107, 117 and 126. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the stop-release operation member does not teach or suggest a plurality of stoppers and a plurality of stopper grooves and combinations thereof as recited in claim 20.

Applicants respectfully note that at Figures 7A-7B of Mizuta disclose enabling respective portions of a touch screen based on the portable terminal being in a closed (retracted), a half-open state, and an open (extended) state between the front-side unit and the back-side unit 200. See paragraph 95 of Mizuta. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Mizuta does not teach or suggest at least features of a stopper mechanism including a plurality of stoppers and plurality of stopper grooves and combinations thereof as recited in claims 20-21. See paragraphs 93-96 and Figures 7A-7B, paragraph 126 and claim 1 of Mizuta.

For at least the reason set forth above applicants respectfully submits claim 20 defines patentable subject matter. As described above, claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 8-10 and 21 depend from claims 1 and 20, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as their additionally recited

Serial No. 10/784,798
Reply to Office Action of September 19, 2005

Docket No. IK-0078

features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-10 and 20-21 under § 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Carl R. Wesolowski, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 10/784,798
Reply to Office Action of September 19, 2005

Docket No. **IK-0078**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 CRW:tlg:jld
Date: November 29, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610